

186.1004.01

REMARKS:Status

Claims 1 to 32 are pending. Claims 1, 7 and 21 have been amended. Claims 1, 17 and 21 are the independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Rejections

Claims 1, 3, 7 to 21, and 26 to 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,463,354 (Pintsov). The remaining claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Pintsov in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,480,191 (Balabanovic), U.S. Patent No. 6,272,532 (Feinleib), or US Patent Pub. No. 2003/0028380 (Freeland).

Discussion

Claims 1 to 16: Claim 1 as amended is reproduced below:

1. A method for customizing a structured document for delivery to an internet appliance, comprising:
 - identifying information units in said structured document;
 - selecting one or more of said information units for delivery;
 - creating in a database a second structured document including said one or more of said information units, said second structured document customized for delivery to said internet appliance; and
 - delivering said second structured document to said internet appliance.

186.1004.01

The art applied against claim 1, namely Pintsov, is not seen by Applicants to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of that claim, at least with respect to "said second structured document customized for delivery to said internet appliance."

In more detail, Pintov discloses an automatic mail delivery notification system. In Pintov, a unique mail ID number can be printed on a mailpiece or encoded within a Digital Postal Mark (DPM) for the mailpiece. A recipient's e-mail address can be recognized by Pintov's system when the ID number or DPM is scanned. This e-mail address can be used to send a notification to the recipient. Pintov also discuss additional aspects of his system.

Nothing in the foregoing process is seen by Applicants to involve customization of a structured document for delivery to an internet appliance. In fact, Pintov does not appear to Applicants to mention customization of any type whatsoever, as can be verified by a word search of Pintov.

Of the remaining references cited in the Office Action, only Freeland mentions customization. See Freeland, paragraphs [148], [281], and [295]. This customization include customization of a supported word-base [148], tools for adding custom user interactive voice features to web pages [281], and custom generation of audio messages [295]. None of these is believed by Applicants to be at all related to customization of a structured document for delivery to an internet appliance.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested of the rejections of claim 1 and its dependent claims 2 to 16, as is allowance of those claims.

186.1004.01

Claims 17 to 20: Claim 17 has not been amended, and the rejection of claim 17 is respectfully traversed. Claim 17 is reproduced below:

17. A database comprising:
 - a user record identifying a user;
 - a device record identifying an internet appliance;
 - a client record identifying a browser running on said internet appliance;
 - a user_client record associating said user record with said client record; and
 - a device profile record associating said user_client record with said device record.

The art applied against claim 17, namely Pintsov, is not seen by Applicants to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of that claim, at least with respect to various ones of the records recited by the claim. In this regard, the Office Action did not even allege that Pintsov discloses the recited records, but rather grouped claim 17 in with the rejection of claim 1.

Pintov does disclose use of a database of mailing addresses that also contains e-mail address of recipients in the address database. However, Applicants do not see any mention that Pintov's database includes claim 17's device record identifying an internet appliance, client record identifying a browser running on the internet appliance, user_client record associating the user record with the client record, or device profile record associating the user_client record with the device record.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested of the rejections of claim 17 and its dependent claims 18 to 20, as is allowance of those claims.

186.1004.01

Claims 21 to 32: Claim 21 as amended is reproduced below:

21. A document customization system, comprising:
 - a management server offering a document customization service to a user;
 - a document manager associated with said management server for performing said document customization service to structured documents identified by said user, said document customization service customizing said structured documents for delivery to an internet appliance;
 - a database accessible by said document manager, said database storing customized structured documents resulting from said document manager performing said document customization service; and
 - a portal for accessing said customized structured documents in said database.

The art applied against claim 21, namely Pintsov, is not seen by Applicants to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of that claim, at least with respect to "said document customization service customizing said structured documents for delivery to an internet appliance."

In more detail, Pintov discloses an automatic mail delivery notification system. In Pintov, a unique mail ID number can be printed on a mailpiece or encoded within a Digital Postal Mark (DPM) for the mailpiece. A recipient's e-mail address can be recognized by Pintov's system when the ID number or DPM is scanned. This e-mail address can be used to send a notification to the recipient. Pintov also discuss additional aspects of his system.

Nothing in the foregoing process is seen by Applicants to involve customization of a structured document for delivery to an internet appliance. In fact, Pintov does not appear to Applicants to mention customization of any type whatsoever, as can be verified by a word search of Pintov.

186.1004.01

Of the remaining references cited in the Office Action, only Freeland mentions customization. See Freeland, paragraphs [148], [281], and [295]. This customization include customization of a supported word-base [148], tools for adding custom user interactive voice features to web pages [281], and custom generation of audio messages [295]. None of these is believed by Applicants to be at all related to customization of a structured document for delivery to an internet appliance.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested of the rejections of claim 1 and its dependent claims 2 to 16, as is allowance of those claims.

Request for Interview

If the Examiner does not find Applicant's arguments to be persuasive, Applicant respectfully requests a telephonic interview with the Examiner, the Examiner's supervisor Ario Ettinene, Applicant's representative Dane. C. Butzer, and Mr. Butzer's supervising attorney at the Swernofsky Law Group, Steven A. Swernofsky.

Closing

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

186.1004.01

Applicants' undersigned attorney can be reached at (614) 486-3585. All correspondence should continue to be directed to the address indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dane C. Butzer

Dated: December 17, 2003

Dane C. Butzer

Reg. No. 43,521

Swernofsky Law Group, PC
P.O. Box 390013
Mountain View, CA 94039-0013
(650) 947-0700